



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/749,045

12/29/2003

Ga-Lane Chen

7405

25859

7590

10/03/2006

WEI TE CHUNG
FOXCONN INTERNATIONAL, INC.
1650 MEMOREX DRIVE
SANTA CLARA, CA 95050

EXAMINER

VARGOT, MATHIEU D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1732

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/749,045

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Mathieu D. Vargot

Art Unit

1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/29/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 1732

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 10, 11 and 13-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nishigaki (see 29 in Fig. 3; col. 3, lines 44-60).

The applied reference discloses the instant mold for producing a light guide plate having the instant first and second plates and a mold cavity defined therebetween, wherein fluid passageways are provided (29 in Fig. 3) on each side wall of each plate which are parallel to the side wall of the other plate. The concavities and papilionaceous cross sectional shape of the cavity is met in the patterns taught for the engraved plate—see column 11, lines 39-48.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishigaki (see 2 in Fig. 1a).

The applied reference discloses the basic claimed mold as set forth in paragraph 1, supra, Nishigaki essentially lacking a showing of a wedge-shaped cavity to make the

light guide plate. However, Fig. 1a of the reference clearly shows such a light guide plate (2) and it surely would have been obvious to have modified/employed the mold to make such a plate. It is submitted that the method of instant claim 20 would also have been obvious over the applied reference. Although Nishigaki shows the mold cavity as being rectangular, clearly wedge-shaped plates are conventional and well known and mold cavities would therefor have been obviously made wedge-shaped to mold them. Also, it is noted that the plurality of cooling passageways would be in fact be arranged as set forth in instant claim 20 in the applied reference should the one side wall be exchanged for a wedge shaped wall-ie, be oblique. The cooling passageways shown in Figure 3 would then be "arranged in a plane with regard to the oblique side wall in a non-parallel manner". Further in regard to this manner, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to determine the desired arrangement of the cooling pipes based on experimental error and design and that such would not constitute a patentable aspect over the applied art.

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishigaki (see col. 5, lines 16-67; col. 9, lines 22-30; col. 9, line 44 through col. 10, line 7; 29 in Figure 3) in view of Choi et al (col. 7, lines 38-42).

Nishigaki discloses the basic claimed method of making a light guide plate as generally set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 supra—see also the above-noted passages-- the primary reference essentially lacking a clear teaching of the instant injection rate. While the primary reference teaches a rate of $1-15 \text{ cm}^3/\text{sec}$, Choi et al discloses that it can be from $1-10,000 \text{ cm}^2/\text{sec}$. Given that the thickness of the plate varies from .3-2mm (.03-.2

Art Unit: 1732


cm), this area flow rate would translate to a volumetric flow rate similar to that of the instant. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have increased the flow rate of the primary reference to that taught in Choi et al to reduce cycle time in forming the light guide plate.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson, can be reached on 571 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot
September 28, 2006


Mathieu D. Vargot
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1732

9/28/06